## 929449



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NUMBER FILING DATE 6UI -108 08/14/92 FINK 07/929.449 EXAMINER 33M1/0713 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER FRANK H. FOSTER 7632 SLATE RIDGE BLVD. . COLUMBUS, OH 43068 3308 DATE MAILED: 67713793 This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS This application has been examined 30 days from the date of this letter. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire\_ month(s), Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: 2. Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. 1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152: 6. 5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION ... are pending in the application. 1. X Claims \_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration. Of the above, claims 2. Claims ... 3. Claims\_ 4. Claims 5. Claims\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement. 6. X Claims 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. \_\_\_ . Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_\_ are acceptable. not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948). has (have) been approved by the 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_ examiner. disapproved by the examiner (see explanation). 11. 

The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, has been approved. disapproved (see explanation). 12. 

Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has 

been received not been received not been received. \_\_\_\_; filed on . been filed in parent application, serial no. 13. 

Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. 14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

PTOL-326 (Rev. 9-89)

Serial Number: 07/929,449 -2-

Art Unit: 3308

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- I. the fluid material comprises ceramic particles which are sintered
- II. the fluid material comprises ceramic particles chich are cemented together with a second ceramic material
- III. the fluid material comprises ceramic particles which are cemented together with a polymer
- IV. the fluid material comprises ceramic particles suspended in a liquid monomer which is polymerized.
- V. the fluid material is a photo-active polymeric material.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1-5 and 11-13 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a response to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 C.F.R. § 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. M.P.E.P. § 809.02(a).

Serial Number: 07/929,449 -3-

Art Unit: 3308

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Randy Shay at telephone number (703) 308-2907 on Mondays and Thursdays.

Randy C. Shay

Primary Examiner Art Unit 330

R. Shay

July 13, 1993